



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PROFESSOR CATTELL'S STATISTICS OF AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGISTS.

By I. MADISON BENTLEY, Cornell University.

I should like to comment on certain points in Professor Cattell's recent census returns, published in the last number of this *Journal*. Criticism of the returns is difficult, both because they form a part of a more comprehensive report not yet published, and because the author's interpretation of the census figures is cautious and conservative. There are, however, two or three matters of interpretation upon which difference of opinion may, I believe, fairly be held.

(1) I am inclined to think that too strong emphasis is laid upon position in order of merit, as determined, in each case, by ten judgments. The interpretation seems to imply that the judges were individually capable of making only gross, not delicate, discriminations of merit. A complete concurrence, *e. g.*, is represented (position one) by a wide gap in the table. But this representation is just only if the gap reappears in the individual judgments. *Degree* of difference does not, however, seem to have been taken into account by the judges. This is simply an illustration. My point is, that more is got out of the average than the individual factors warrant. Another illustration of the same thing appears in the fact that the average assumes equal validity for all judgments. Now the admission is made that the judges did "not possess equal information or judgment" and, also, that "many of those who made the arrangement stated that they had but little confidence in its validity." I do not see how, under these circumstances, 'validity of judgment' can be measured, as the author proposes, by an m. v. of individual judgments from the average of the ten observations. The best informed and most judicious observer may have been just the one to vary most widely from the average.

(2) In grading men of so young a science as psychology, it should be noted that "contributions to the advancement" of the science (the meaning of 'merit' accepted in the statistics under discussion) depend not only upon age but upon length of service and upon the time at which reputation is acquired. M's contributions of twenty-five years may give him fourth place, let us say, while N's contributions, covering five years (perhaps at a different stage of the science), give him twelfth

place. It is, I take it, much more difficult to get a wide reputation in psychology now than it was ten or fifteen years ago. It seems unjust, at all events, to designate M— on the basis of his position in the table—a 'moderate genius,' and N, a 'man of talent.' Length of service and date of reputation may have been taken into account by Professor Cattell's judges; I see no evidence that they were.

(3) Similar allowance should be made for Table III, which gives geographical distribution of psychological students. In comparing the number of psychologists graduated from various institutions, we must take into account that one college or university has taught psychology five years, another, fifteen years; that one has only undergraduate courses in the subject, another, graduate courses, as well; that one has required courses, another, only electives; that one has, in proportion to its size, a large psychological faculty, another, a small faculty. These are factors that we ought not, perhaps, to expect to find in a broad interpretation of the statistical results, but they are worth noting, if only to show the limitations to which the figures are subject.

I have not meant, in commenting on Professor Cattell's statistics, to throw doubt upon the validity of the method. I should venture, rather, to suggest that the method be further elaborated and refined. The first report upon the returns leads me to think that elaboration and refinement will make the method still more useful. Subsequent reports may, however, prove that the modifications suggested were already under consideration.